REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 959 JC 670 288

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS IN CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES.

BY- FITCH, NAOMI

CALIFORNIA UNIV., BERKELEY

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.44 84P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *COLLEGE FACULTY, TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER RATING, TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, EFFECTIVE TEACHING, STUDENT OPINION, CALIFORNIA,

THE MAJOR PORTION OF THIS REPORT CONSISTS OF (1) A SERIES OF EXCERPTS FROM ACCREDITATION APPLICATIONS, PRESENTING POLICIES AND/OR PROCEDURES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION AT 23 CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES, (2) SAMPLES OF FORMS FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION, (3) SAMPLES OF FORMS FOR ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OF TEACHERS, AND (4) SAMPLES OF CLASSROOM VISITATION REPORT FORMS. (WO)

ED014959

ERIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of Instructors

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

JC 670 288

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS
IN
CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 27 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Submitted to:

Dr. J. Chester Swanson
Professor of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

by

Mrs. Naomi Fitch
Director of Occupational Services
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

In partial fulfillment
of the work for
242C Administrative Behavior
and Organization:
Personnel Administration

University of California, Berkeley
Fall, 1965

DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES

Copy Number

1. Dr. J. Chester Swanson
University of California
Berkeley, California

2. Dr. Dale Tillery
University of California
Berkeley, California

3. Dr. J. Lamar Johnson
University of California
Los Angeles, California

4. Research Library
California Teachers Association
Burlingame, California

5. Dr. Burke W. Bradley
Superintendent-President
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

6. Mr. Joseph L. Blanchard
Assistant Superintendent-Vice President
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

7-14 Division Chairmen
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

15-25 Special Requests
Junior Colleges Participating in Survey
California

26-45 Faculty Senate
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

46-56 Reserved Copies
Mrs. Naomi Fitch
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Number

Evaluation of Instructors in California Junior Colleges. 1-6

References 7-9

APPENDIX

Excerpts From Accreditation Reports. . . . 1-11

Student Evaluations of Instructors 12-23

Certificated Personnel Evaluations 24-41

Evaluation Report on Probationary Instructors. 42-47

Classroom Visitation Evaluations 48-55

EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTORS
IN
CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES

A COMPLEX PROCEDURE

The assessment of teaching competence is a complex procedure which can result in marked improvement in instruction. The appraisal of instructional effectiveness in California Junior Colleges usually includes a visit or two by an administrator who often considers it a routine chore to evaluate the new instructors.

DIRECT APPRAISAL PROCEDURES

Eckert (11), in discussing possible approaches to the evaluation of instructional effectiveness, listed four direct appraisal procedures:

(a) Consideration of study guides, examinations and other materials prepared for teaching purposes;

(b) Ratings by administrators;

(c) Student ratings; and

(d) Evidences of student achievement.

BASIS OF EVALUATION

It has long been recognized that attempts to evaluate teaching effectiveness have not been satisfactory. Often an administrator, after making one visit to a classroom, will make an evaluation based on the observations of that one session.

RATING BY STUDENTS

Many administrators in California Junior Colleges are searching for methods of evaluation which will result in improvement of instruction. Recently attention has been turned to the student as the one person who views the teacher in his day to day teaching activities. A few junior colleges in California encourage teachers to use student rating forms similar to "Student Rating of Instructors" adapted from Riley (37), The Student Looks at His Teacher.

LIBRARY FILE OF RATING FORMS

Some California Junior Colleges maintain a file of student rating forms in the college library from which faculty members may select the rating forms most appropriate for the courses taught. Samples of these student rating forms may be found in the appendix of this report on pages 12-23. Most student rating forms have been used on a voluntary basis and for the improvement of instruction. Instructors are not required to turn over the student rating forms for administrative evaluation.

LIBRARY FILE OF RATING FORMS - cont.

Although considerable doubt has been expressed concerning students' ability to recognize good teaching, studies made so far have failed to support the contention that these evaluations are related to grades received (4), class size (17), class level (7), or sex (37).

EVALUATION FORMS USED

Several California Junior Colleges publish their evaluation forms so all instructors may review the items for purposes of self-evaluation.

Some junior colleges have a complete description of the evaluation procedures and forms used included in the faculty handbook.

One junior college includes copies of the evaluation forms in the salary handbook.

TOP SECRET

Other junior colleges treat their evaluation forms as "top secret" and only after the form has been filled out and the instructor called in for an interview is the form revealed to the panic stricken new instructor.

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES

Follow-up studies are used to obtain evaluative information relating to the effectiveness of instruction. Pace (31) has called the rationale of follow-up studies a significant extension of educational research. Sample follow-up forms may

FOLLOW-UP STUDIES - cont.

be found in the appendix of this report.

EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

As part of the application for accreditation junior colleges summarize the procedures used in evaluating the effectiveness of instruction.

The appendix of this study includes excerpts from twenty-three accreditation applications. These excerpts indicate that appraisal is a continuing process. Many colleges invite their instructors to complete self-evaluation forms and to administer questionnaires to discover student attitudes toward effectiveness. Student evaluations are treated as confidential and the results are known only to the instructor who administers the student attitudes questionnaire.

Sample forms for the "student evaluation of instructors" may be found in the appendix of this report, pages 12-23.

The tabulation of student evaluation forms appearing on the next page indicates the type of items used to enable students to evaluate instruction. This tabulation is followed by a tabulation of items used by administrators in evaluating instructors.

STUDENTS EVALUATE INSTRUCTION

in

California Junior Colleges
(Items Included on Evaluation Forms)

	Number of Schools
Organization of Course Content	13
Teaching Methods	7
Concern for Student Progress	13
Clearness of Examination Questions	1
Importance of Examination Questions	5
Encouragement of Thinking	9
Manner of Speaking	10
Ability to Explain	15
Attitude toward Subject	17
General Rating Compared to all Instructors	7
Knowledge of Subject	13
Quality of Examinations	18
Subject Matter Kept up to date	2
Class Management and Discipline	6
Personal Appearance	4
Sense of Humor	6
Level of Standards of Instruction	2
Usefulness of Subject Matter	6
Interest of Subject Matter	8
Quality of Textbook	5
Requirement of Course	1
Difficulty of Textbook	2
Manner of Instructor	7
Improvements	4
Grading of Instructor	3
Good Points of Instructors Teaching	4
Preparation for Each Class	3
Assignments	8
Judgment of Values	2
Class Discussion and Questions	5
Poise and Self-confidence	3
Tolerance	3
Grading Methods	4
Time Sutdent Spends on Course	2
Overall Rating of Course	1
Willingness to Accept Different Points of View	1
Willingness to Help Students Out of Class	1
Recommendation of Class to Others	2
Lecture	1
Labs	1

ADMINISTRATORS EVALUATE INSTRUCTORS

in

California Junior Colleges
(Items Included on Instructor Evaluations)

	Number of Schools
Personal Qualities	17
Professional Qualities	14
Professional Competence	11
Overall Effectiveness	5
Improvements	6
Specific Abilities	2
Teaching Technique	11
Knowledge of Subject	11
Enthusiasm	9
Sense of Humor	3
Appearance	12
Voice	9
Organization	10
Accuracy and Promptness of Records	2
Use of Supplies and Equipment	10
Acceptance of Suggestions	6
Co-curricular Activities	6
Student-Instructor Relationship	18
Instructor-Instructor Relationship	11
Instructor-Administration Relationship	10
Effectiveness of Instruction	12
Classroom Management	10
Recommended for Re-Employment	6
Not Recommended for Re-Employment	6
Presentation of Subject Matter	10
Health	7
Punctuality	2
Judgment	3
Resourcefulness and originality	4
Motivation	5
Assignments	2
Preparation	13
Class Participation	4

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. A.C.E. Cooperation in General Education. The Council, 1947. 240 p.

2. Bloom, Benjamin S. "How May the Special Contributions of Liberal Arts Education Be Evaluated?" In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954. Association for Higher Education, 1954. p. 283-87.

3. Brumbaugh, Aaron J. "Role of Evaluation in the Development and Improvement of Regional Programs of Higher Education." J Exp Ed 25:43-48; 1956.

4. Clark, Kenneth E., and Keller, Robert J. "Student Ratings of College Teaching." In Eckert, Ruth E., and Keller, Robert J. (Eds.) A University Looks at Its Program. U Minnesota, 1954. p. 197-212.

5. Cogan, Morris L. "Theory of Design of a Study of Teacher-Pupil Interaction." Harvard Ed R 26:315-41; 1956.

6. Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improve School Practice. TC, 1953. 161 p.

7. Crannell, Clarke W. "An Experiment in the Rating of Instructors by Their Students." Col and U 24:5-11; 1948.

8. Dressel, Paul L. "Problems in the Evaluation of General Education." In Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954. Association for Higher Education, 1954. p. 278-82.

9. Dressel, Paul L., and Mayhew, Lewis B. General Education: Explorations in Evaluation, ACE, 1954. 302 p.

10. Eckert, Ruth E. Outcomes of General Education. U Minnesota, 1943, 210 p.

11. Eckert, Ruth E. "Ways of Evaluating College Teaching." Sch Soc 71: 65-69; 1950.

12. Eckert, Ruth E. "Evaluation in General Education." In General Education 51st Yearbook, Part 1, N.S.S.E. U Chicago, 1952, p. 250-78.

13. Eells, Walter C. Surveys of American Higher Education. Carnegie Foundation, 1937. 538 p.

14. Eurich, Alvin C. "A Plan of Evaluation for Bennington College." J Ed Res 34: 633-34; 1941.

15. Gustad, John W. "Changes in Social Attitudes and Behavior; A Review of the Literature." Ed Psychol Meas 11: 87-102; 1951.

16. Guthrie, Edwin R. "The Evaluation of Teaching." Ed Rec 30:109-15; 1949.

17. Guthrie, Edwin R. The Evaluation of Teaching: A Progress Report. U Washington, 1954. 18 p.

References - cont.

18. Havemann, Ernest, and West, Patricia. They Went to College. Harcourt, 1952. 227 p.

19. Hollis, Ernest V., and Martorana, S. V. "Advance Planning for Higher Education in the United States." J Higher Ed 12: 101-8; 1956.

20. Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College. Edward W. Hazen, 1956. 178 p.

21. Jones, Edward S. Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges. Macmillan, 1933. 436 p.

22. Knapp, Robert H., and Greenbaum, G.G. The Younger American Scholar: His Collegiate Origin. U Chicago. 1953. 122 p.

23. Learned, William S., and Wood, Ben D. The Student and His Knowledge. Carnegie Foundation, 1938. 406 p.

24. Minnesota Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education in Minnesota. U Minnesota, 1950. 419 p.

25. Mueller, Francis J. "Trends in Student Ratings of Faculty." Am Assn U Prof B 37:319-24; 1951.

26. New York University. The New York University Self Study. New York U. 1956. 286 p.

27. Norem, Grant M., and Others. "An Evaluation Schedule for Academic Ranking." Peabody J Ed 28:21041; 1950.

28. N.S.S.E. The Measurement of Understanding. 45th Yearbook, Part 1. U Chicago. 1946. 338 p.

29. Ogan, Ralph (Ed.) A College Looks at Its Program. Muskingum C. 1937. 326 p.

30. Pace, C. Robert. They Went to College. U Minnesota. 1941. 148 p.

31. Pace, C. Robert. "Follow-up Studies of College Graduates." In Growing Points in Educational Research. Official Report, AERA. 1949. p. 285-90.

32. Pace, C. Robert. "How Does an Institution Organize and Conduct an Effective Self-Evaluation?" In Current Issues in Higher Education. 1954. p. 251-59.

33. Reeves, Floyd W., and Russell, John Dale. College Organization and Administration. Disciples of Christ, 1929. 324 p.

34. Reeves, Floyd W., and Others. The University of Chicago Survey. 12 Vols. U Chicago, 1933.

35. Remmers. H. H. (Ch.) "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness." R Ed Res 22:238-63; 1952.

36. Remmers, H. H. (Ch.) "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness." J Ed Res 46:641-58; 1953.

References - cont.

37. Riley, John W., and Others. The Student Looks at His Teacher. Rutgers U, 1950. 166 p.

38. St. Scholastica College. The First Fifteen Years of the College of St. Scholastica. Fordham U, 1947. 184 p.

39. Stern, George G., and Others. Methods in Personality Assessment. Free. 1956. 271 p.

40. Troyer, Maurice E., and Pace, C. Robert. Self Survey; Report to the Faculty. Syracuse U, 1949. 75 p.

41. Woodburne, Lloyd S. "The Qualifications of Superior Faculty Members." J Higher Ed 23:377-82; 1952.

42. Zook, George F., and Haggerty, Melvin E. Principles of Accrediting Higher Institutions. U Chicago, 1936. 202 p.

APPENDIX

EXCERPTS FROM ACCREDITATION REPORTS

EVALUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS

AMERICAN RIVER JUNIOR COLLEGE

An outstanding faculty, drawn from all sections of the nation through carefully planned recruitment procedures, is considered the primary route to an effective teaching program. Provisions for professional growth, including sabbatical leaves, are also considered an essential part of the effort to achieve instructional objectives. Instructors are encouraged to meet with and exchange ideas and techniques with other specialists in their fields, and such developments as team teaching, closed-circuit television in the science laboratories, foreign language teaching programs such as the "Voix et Images de France," are all in part the outgrowths of continuous professional interaction and planned professional growth activities.

Systematic procedures have been developed for classroom visits by supervisory personnel and for follow-up conferences. Communication among instructors is ensured by frequent and regular meetings of divisions, meetings of division chairmen, curriculum committees, and committees concerned with professional standards. Appraisal is a constant process, and assistance is readily available especially for new instructors who may be in need of help. Particular efforts are made to assist these faculty members, whose classes are visited regularly. Instructors are invited to complete self-evaluation forms and to administer questionnaires to discover student attitudes toward their teaching effectiveness. The latter are treated as confidential, and their results are known only to the instructor.

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

Regular visits are made to the classes of probationary instructors by division and department chairmen and the Dean of Instruction. First-year instructors are also visited by the college president and the assistant superintendent of the district. Each of the visits is followed by an interview with the instructor.

Administrative officers are always available to instructors for counsel when the need is felt.

Instructors in a particular department or subject area meet to discuss courses. For example:

> Instructors of courses for the nursing students review the content of their courses to avoid overlap or omission.
>
> Instructors in English composition meet regularly to evaluate sample essays. Department examinations are also used in English.
>
> Instructors in mathematics meet to coordinate mathematics classes and to insure common purposes.
>
> Regular meetings are held by instructors in Psychology 1a and in other social science courses taught by more than one instructor.

CABRILLO COLLEGE

Evaluation of faculty members is made by the administrative staff on the following criteria: organization of teaching materials, knowledge of subject, rapport with students, rapport with staff, attention to records, classroom instruction, community relations, and professional growth.

The president and director of instruction visit the classes of all instructors several times each year. Instructors are free to discuss findings with either or both administrators. In April and May of each year an official "Instructor Evaluation" sheet is prepared and discussed with individual staff members.

CHABOT COLLEGE

Instructors are evaluated during their probationary period through many informal contacts, in committee work, and by classroom visitations. Formal classroom visitations are made by the President, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Personnel, Assistant Deans of Instruction, and the Division Chairmen. A brief description of this process follows:

Instructors, probationary and permanent, are visited periodically by a member of the administrative staff during the school year. Following each class observation, a follow-up conference is held. During these conferences, teaching achievements and problems related to these and similar areas are discussed: the class as a whole, individual student progress, planning, class objectives and methodology, curriculum innovations, etc. A Classroom Observation Consultation Form is then filled out in duplicate and signed by the administrator and the instructor. One copy is given to the instructor and one copy is placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append a written statement to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

In addition to classroom evaluations, there are periodic consultations to review faculty progress as described below:

Each full-time instructor, probationary and permanent, participates in a general evaluation conference with a designated administrator at least once a year. In the case of probationary instructors, this conference is held prior to February 15. This general rating conference is concerned with the instructor's effectiveness as a faculty member, both in and out of the classroom, in terms of the criteria underlying District policy. A Periodic Consultation Form is filled out in duplicate and signed by the administrator and by the instructor. One copy is given to the instructor, and one copy is placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append a written statement to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

COALINGA COLLEGE

The evaluation of staff effectiveness is the responsibility of the Superintendent and President. The Administrative Code of the Governing Board of the Coalinga Junior College District provides the rules and regulations under which staff effectiveness is evaluated. Both permanent and probationary teachers are evaluated each year.

COMPTON COLLEGE

New faculty members are evaluated on the basis of effectiveness in the following areas, although not necessarily in the order listed: class performance, professional attitudes and philosophy, the ability to work cooperatively with other members of the entire staff, meeting assigned obligations at specified times.

A procedure exists by means of which department chairmen and the Dean of Instruction visit classes of probationary personnel at least once each semester, rate the personnel visited, and interview them on the basis of the rating sheet. Visitations are designed for the purpose of assisting the faculty member in becoming an effective member of the staff, and all visitations and subsequent interviews are handled in a manner that insures the maximum degree of cordiality and rapport.

COLLEGE OF THE DESERT

Evaluation consists of several procedures including:

Ratings by the department chairmen, the Dean of Instruction, the President of the College.

Ratings by students. This is accomplished by each faculty member on a voluntary basis. No standard student rating form is used. A file of student rating forms is maintained in the library from which faculty members may select those most desirable and appropriate for the courses taught.

Class visits are conducted by the Dean of Instruction, the President of the College, and the department chairmen.

Frequent interviews are held by the Dean of Instruction and the President with individual faculty members to discuss ratings and any other personal or professional matters relating to the effectiveness of the instructor in his assignment.

Informal faculty discussion meetings are scheduled throughout the year to discuss such subjects as grading, very able students, visual aids, class size and teaching effectiveness, etc.

GROSSMONT COLLEGE

The Committee on Curriculum and Instruction has devoted weekly meetings during the 1962 fall semester to the development of a recommended statement of criteria for evaluation. During the 1961-62 academic year each contract instructor was visited at least twice by the Dean of Instruction and a formal report of evaluation was prepared after the second or third visit. The President also visited instructors' classes. Copies of all evaluation reports were forwarded through the President's Office for his additional comment and then a copy was sent to the instructor for his response and return. These reports are on file in the instructors' personnel files. When deemed advisable by the administration or when requested by the instructor, a follow-up interview with the Dean of Instruction or the President was arranged.

During the fall semester of 1962 all new contract instructors were visited at least once, and it is anticipated that formal reports will again be made after the second visit planned for February and March. By 1963-64 this crucial but time-consuming job will be shared with departmental chairmen and perhaps by a new Director of Vocational-Technical Education. It is obvious that as a college grows in size the magnitude of this task also increases; yet there is general agreement that this emphasis on evaluation has contributed toward making the reputation for top caliber teaching in junior colleges a deserved one. Sharing of this task with departmental chairmen also should allow for closer evaluation of the Evening Division instructors which has been less comprehensive so far than it has been during the day program.

ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE

Classroom visits are made by the Vice-President for instruction and the President. Department heads may visit classes, but this is not considered as a required responsibility.

All staff members are urged but not required to use student evaluation as a means of improving instruction. Results of student evaluations are sometimes provided the administration, but only on a voluntary basis.

An effort is made to visit the classes of non-tenured instructors three times per year. If weaknesses are observed, additional visits are made. On the other hand, an instructor who is judged as superior may not be visited that often. An observation form is filled out following classroom visitation and the results are discussed with the instructor.

LOS ANGELES JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

Rating Sheet - Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness.

1. Relationships and cooperation: (This refers to tact, sincerity, friendliness, sense of humor, attitude in working with others, willingness to assume and share responsibility.)
    - A. With students.
    - B. With school staff and other personnel

LOS ANGELES JUNIOR COLLEGE OF BUSINESS - cont.

2. Personal traits: (Appearance, dress, grooming, posture, voice, etc.)

3. Classroom Teaching
   A. Command of Subject
   B. Physical Performance
   C. Organization of Material
   D. Use of Devices
   E. Rapport

4. Overall rating - Outstanding, strong, average, weak, unsatisfactory

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE

In conformity with Los Angeles Board of Education Personnel Division requirements, all probationary teachers are evaluated once each semester until they are eligible for tenure.

The evaluation process involves conferences between the deans, department coordinators, and the probationary teachers concerned. Observations made by deans and coordinators, through actual classroom visitations, are an important part of the process. Suggested items for consideration are:

(1) Appearance and grooming; (2) Mental alertness, creative ability and originality; (3) Effectiveness of voice and speech; (4) Ability to express himself orally and in writing; (5) Emotional balance; (6) Health and vitality; (7) Mastery of subject matter; (8) Skill in planning; (9) success in carrying out plans; (10) Attention to fundamental skills; (11) Skill in use of accepted methods and procedures; (12) Provision for individual differences; (13) Skill in growth and achievement, evaluation of pupils'; (14) Skill in classroom management and control; (15) Effectiveness as an inspirational leader; (16) Success in working cooperatively with administrators and supervisors; (17) Success in working cooperatively with parents; (19) Promptness and accuracy in carrying out assigned duties; (20) Punctuality and regularity in attendance; (21) Professional growth; (22) Skill in furthering and safeguarding pupil health; (23) Skill in housekeeping, and in maintaining proper physical conditions in the classroom.

The evaluation report includes: the date of the conference with employee; specific strengths discussed in conference; specific needs discussed and recommendations made for improving services; recommendation for employee to be continued or discontinued in service; and evaluation of the services of the employee as "unsatisfactory", "weak", "strong", or "outstanding".

If it is determined that an instructor is to be rated as "unsatisfactory", a special report is made on a Personnel Division Form 1015-5 Unsatisfactory Notice. The rater, in this instance, must state on this form: "I visited the above employee and observed his work on the following dates" also, the rater must state reasons why he considered the services of the employee to be unsatisfactory for the period indicated.

COLLEGE OF MARIN

A system of evaluation of probationary teachers was developed during the 1959-60 and 1960-61 school years and revised several times. Each probationary teacher is evaluated by a committee composed of one administrator (usually the Dean or Assistant Dean of Instruction), the Division Chairman, and the Department Head. The aid of faculty members is requested at times. This committee evaluates the teacher, makes a statement of strengths and weaknesses, and recommends retention or dismissal to the President.

MODESTO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Evaluation consists of several procedures including:

Ratings by the Department Chairmen and the Vice President of the College.

Ratings by students. This is accomplished by each faculty member on a voluntary basis. No standard student rating form is used. A file of student rating forms is maintained in the library from which faculty members may select those most desirable and appropriate for the courses taught.

Class visits are conducted by the Vice President of the college and the Department Chairman.

Frequent interviews are held by the Vice President and the President with individual faculty members to discuss ratings and any other personal and professional matters contributing to the effectiveness of the instructor in his assignment.

Informal faculty discussion meetings are scheduled throughout the year to discuss such subjects as grading, very able students, visual aids, class size, and teaching effectiveness, etc.

NAPA COLLEGE

Each year teachers who are not on tenure are rated according to the attached rating sheet. This rating is performed by the President or the Director of the Junior College in conference with the teacher concerned. The teacher has opportunity to make any appropriate comment concerning his rating report. This report is then filed with the District Administration Office.

OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE

The Dean of the campus is officially responsible for evaluating the effectiveness of faculty members. In the Oakland City College, however, this responsibility is delegated to the Associate Dean, Administration, at the Merritt Campus, and the Associate Dean, Instruction, at the Laney campus. The Dean and the Associate Dean have a close working relationship in this evaluation process.

OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE - cont.

At the Merritt Campus, an effort is being made to involve department chairmen and permanent members of the teaching staff in some phases of the evaluation process, but as yet, no established procedures have been developed. The Mathematics Department is undertaking a pilot project in this area.

The campus administrator may call upon the services of central office supervisors of instruction to assist in evaluation and in improvement of instructional services.

During the three-year probationary period for certificated staff, annual reports are made to the director of the college and to the director of personnel on forms provided by the district. The Dean and/or the Associate Dean at the campus discuss with the instructor the evaluation which is being submitted, and both the administrator and the instructor sign the report.

Every five years an evaluation report for tenure instructors is submitted by the Dean of the campus to the Director of Personnel through the Director of the city college. When tenure instructors from other schools in the Oakland Unified School District are transferred to the Oakland City College, an evaluation report is submitted at the end of the first year.

A pamphlet, "The Guide for the Evaluation and Improvement of Professional Services", is provided by the Director as the basic device to be used for evaluation of certificated staff.

OCEANSIDE-CARLSBAD COLLEGE

The evaluation of the effectiveness of college staff members is a responsibility of the President and other administrators. A teacher evaluation form is submitted to the Superintendent at the end of each year for permanent personnel and at the end of each semester for temporary employees. These evaluations are the result of class visitations, general observations, and informal student attitudes. The teacher evaluation form is discussed by the President with the instructor concerned before it is sent to the Superintendent.

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE

Evaluation is here defined as a process designed to measure an instructor's effectiveness in dealing with all of his duties and responsibilities. The main purposes of evaluation at Porterville College are: (a) to improve instruction; (b) to make it possible for a teacher to realize his highest potential; (c) to make administrative decisions. Evaluation must necessarily lead to an appraisal of competency. The term "competency" is considered to mean satisfactory service of probationary employees, there are only two degrees of competence: SATISFACTORY or UNSATISFACTORY.

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE - cont.

All instructors are evaluated in several ways in order to determine their effectiveness. In selecting an instrument for administrative evaluation by classroom visitation, several instruments for the evaluation of the quality of instruction were studied. The instrument designed for Porterville College incorporated ideas from the instruments studied, from teacher's rated charts, and from other guides for the evaluation of the improvement of professional services.

The instructors are evaluated by classroom visitations by the Dean of Instruction and by the Director. In these visitations, the instrument is kept in mind and used in the interview with the instructor and in the interview which follows between the Dean of Instruction and the Director. In addition to the use of instruments and classroom visitation, both informal and formal meetings of Instructors, Dean of Instruction, Director, and Department Chairman take place to assist in the improvement of instruction. All instructors utilize student rating forms annually; information is confidential to the instructor, but each instructor submits an anonymous tally report for comparative purposes.

Follow-up studies, student interviews, reports from transfer institution, and interviews with employees of Porterville College Alumni are other methods used in the evaluation for effectiveness of personnel.

REEDLEY COLLEGE

Formal evaluation of teachers is conducted as provided in section 3-112.3 and 3-500 of the Governing Board Policies Regulations Manual. In a small institution with considerable personal interaction, the formal evaluation can often be validated by a more informal situation resulting from the day to day contacts.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE

Final judgment and recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the continued employment of a teacher are made by the President of the college; the Vice-President for Instruction assembles the evidence and makes a recommendation. Effort is made to get all recommendations completed by April 1 of an academic year. In making these recommendations, the following kinds of evidence are used:

> At the time of each recommendation, the teacher's total educational preparation for junior college teaching is reassessed. This puts particular attention upon the continuing education that the teacher has sought during the period of his employment by the college.
>
> The vice-president for Instruction arrives at an accumulative judgment of the suitability of the instructor's personality for junior college teaching.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE - cont.

Through conferences, observation of work with teacher groups, and reports from all sources, the Vice-President for Instruction arrives at an accumulative judgment as to the effectiveness of the teacher's class work.

Evidence is assembled as to the amount and quality of the teacher's participation in the non-instructional activities of the college. While these activities are given less weight than teaching effectiveness, they, nevertheless, are considered to be important criteria for selection of new junior college teachers.

Evidence as to the degree of cooperation of a teacher in the various kinds of interpersonal relationships on the campus are assembled.

The Vice-President for Instruction secures reports covering numerous items on the teacher being evaluated from the chairman of his instructional division.

Reports are also secured, in writing, from the Deans, the Director of Counseling, the Director of Extended Day classes, and the College Business Office. All of these are thought of as supplementary evidences collected to help guard against gross mistakes in judgment.

A standardized instrument, developed for securing anonymous student ratings of teachers, is obtained after completion of the first semester. These ratings are analyzed to determine their contribution to the total evaluation of a probationary instructor.

Self-evaluation reports are secured from each instructor being rated. These reports are made to the Vice-President for Instruction on a form supplied by his office. They seek a first-hand statement about the teacher's participation in the activities of the college.

SAN DIEGO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Summarized briefly, evaluation procedures of the District and the College are designed to provide a situation which is conducive to the employment and maintenance of a highly qualified teaching staff. Cooperatively developed, it provides the opportunity for teachers to consciously improve their service to the College as well as the method by which the College can carry forward a continuous program of in-service training to insure control of a high level of quality in its professional staff.

An evaluation report is made twice each year for all probationary teachers and for permanent teachers who receive an unsatisfactory rating. A report for all other permanent teachers is submitted once each year. In cases where severance is necessary, District policy is followed. Each evaluation made during the three-year probationary period requires a conference between the Director and the teacher. Both sign an evaluation form at the close of the conference, certifying discussion of the factors involved. Teachers are recommended for tenure after three years of successful teaching experience in the District.

SANTA ROSA JUNIOR COLLEGE

The President as well as other staff members check informally with new personnel to clarify procedures or assist in the solution of problems. The President schedules an individual conference about six weeks into the term to discuss any topic he or the new faculty member wishes to raise. A program of class visitations is carried out by the president with the advance knowledge and agreement of new personnel. A subsequent conference is then scheduled with the faculty member.

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE

The Teacher Evaluation form specifies the frequency of submitting the evaluations of each instructor.

The evaluation of instructors at Southwestern College is an attempt to improve the total instructional program. Three evaluations are given first year instructors, two to all other probationary instructors and one to permanent instructors. The primary responsibility for instructor evaluation rests with the Dean of Instruction. However, it has also been the practice of the President to make classroom visits, particularly when there is a reasonable doubt about the effectiveness of an individual instructor. All instructors marked "unsatisfactory" in any area are given individual interviews to review their particular problem. All other instructors have a personal conference with the Dean of Instruction indicating their evaluation.

A student evaluation form is made available and all instructors are encouraged to use the form with their classes. The use is optional and the administration does not request to see the results.

The evaluation of all hourly-rate instructors is jointly shared by the Dean of Instruction, Assistant Dean of Instruction, and by the Division Chairmen. These instructors are rated once during each semester and again they are notified of any inefficiencies that are reported.

VALLEJO JUNIOR COLLEGE

Each faculty member is evaluated at least once each year at a principal-teacher conference which covers all areas of teaching including mastery of subject matter, classroom management, professional interest, and personal characteristics.

STUDENT EVALUATIONS

OF

INSTRUCTORS

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Instructor's Name ____________________ Course __________ Date __________

Directions: Read the entire sheet BEFORE you mark any response. In the left-hand margin number the items 1, 2, and 3 that you consider to be the three most significant on the sheet. Place a cross (+) at the point on the scale that most accurately represents your considered opinion of each trait. DO NOT sign your name to this paper. Your fair and honest opinion is what really counts, as your instructor desires this rating for his own self-improvement.

______	KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT	( ) Very well-informed	( ) Well-informed	( ) Limited background	( ) Poorly informed
______	PRESENTATION	( ) Stimulating	( ) Adequate	( ) Routine	( ) Dull
______	ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT	( ) Very considerate	( ) Considerate	( ) Sometimes intolerant	( ) Inconsiderate and rude
______	EXPLANATIONS	( ) Very clear	( ) Clear	( ) Confused	( ) Faulty
______	POISE	( ) Highly poised	( ) Poised	( ) Easily upset	( ) Highly insecure
______	ORGANIZATION OF COURSE	( ) Well organized	( ) Organized	( ) Lacks continuity	( ) Confused
______	ASSIGNMENTS	( ) Very clear	( ) Clear	( ) Indefinite	( ) Very vague
______	EXAMINATION QUESTIONS	( ) Clear and relevent	( ) Adequate	( ) Sometimes confusing	( ) Irrelevant and not clear
______	GRADING METHODS	( ) Very fair	( ) Fair	( ) Inconsistent	( ) Biased
______	TIME STUDENT SPENDS ON COURSE	( ) More than any other	( ) More than average	( ) Less than Average	( ) Less than any other
______	TEXTBOOK VALUE	( ) Great	( ) Some	( ) Limited	( ) Very little
______	ATTITUDE TOWARD COURSE	( ) Very favorable	( ) Favorable	( ) Indifferent	( ) Negative

CHABOT COLLEGE

STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTOR

Please evaluate your instructor on the attributes listed below. Since no names are placed on these pages complete anonymity is insured. Feel free to express your opinion frankly. At the same time, since your instructor is interested in improving his instructional techniques and has volunteered to this survey, it is to the advantage of all to evaluate as fairly and objectively as possible.

You should bear in mind other college teachers you have known (in required courses as well as elective courses or courses in your major field) and place your mark along the line to rate your instructor in comparison with other college teachers you have had.

Check (✓) anywhere along the top of the line. Please read each item carefully.

Is your instructor clear and understandable in his explanations?

confusing	5	4	3	2	1	clear

Does your instructor take an active personal interest in the progress of the class?

interested in the class	1	2	3	4	5	disinterested in the class

Is your instructor friendly and sympathetic in manner?

unfriendly, unsympathetic	5	4	3	2	1	friendly, sympathetic

Does your instructor show interest and enthusiasm in this course?

unenthusiastic	5	4	3	2	1	enthusiastic

Does your instructor interest students in his subject matter?

interests students in subject matter	1	2	3	4	5	does not interest students in subject matter

How would you evaluate the level of difficulty of your instructor's tests?

difficult	1	2	3	4	5	easy

How well do your instructor's tests sample the material covered in the class and in the text book?

fairly	1	2	3	4	5	unfair coverage

What do you believe your instructor has done especially well in his teaching of this course?

What specific things do you believe your instructor might do to improve the teaching in this course?

If you were grading your instructor as A B C D F, what grade would you give?

How valuable was the course to you?

valuable, worth the time invested	1	2	3	4	5	not valuable, a complete waste of time

Form #:

CHABOT COLLEGE

EVALUATION SHEET

The purpose of this brief questionnaire is to help me improve the course. Your candid comments, criticisms, and suggestions are appreciated. Please do not sign your name. Thank you.

LECTURE: The lectures were mainly helpful_____, fair_____, mainly useless_____

Comments:

HOMEWORK: The assignments were too long_____, about right_____, too short_____.

They were too difficult_____, about right_____, too easy_____.

Comments:

LABS: The labs were good_____, fair_____, waste of time_____.

Best experiment:____

Poorest experiment:____

Comments:

TEXTBOOK: I found the text good_____, fair_____, poor_____.

I found the lab manual good_____, fair_____, poor_____.

Comments:

EXAMS: The exams were a fair test of the subject matter: Yes_____, No_____.

I would prefer more_____, same number_____, fewer_____tests.

Comments:

COMPREHENSION: What helped you most? Mark in order of importance, "1" for most, "5" for least.

Lecture __________
Lab __________
Text __________
Homework __________
Class discussion__________
Comments:

EVALUATION SHEET
Page 2

DIFFICULTY & INTEREST: Name the

1. Most difficult topic ______________________________
2. Easiest topic ______________________________
3. Most interesting topic ______________________________
4. Least interesting topic______________________________

Comments:

General comments, criticisms, and suggestions:

5-29-64
Form #2

COALINGA COLLEGE

FACULTY RATING FORM

____
Date

Year in School__________ Sex__________ Major______________

TO THE STUDENT:

I have requested that this rating be made. The results will be given to me for information and use. They will not be shown to anyone else without my consent. The purpose of the project is the improvement of teaching methods through constructive student evaluation.

RATING OF INSTRUCTOR:

Consider carefully each of the items listed below and rate each one as fairly and as objectively as you would want me to rate you. Try not to let your general dislike or liking of me or of the course affect your judgment on each individual item. Indicate by ENCIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTER AFTER EACH ITEM.

(a) Check the difficulty of this course, taking into account the purpose and curricular level, amount of time and effort required outside of classroom and laboratory, and the number of hours of credit given.
A - Very difficult; B - Moderately difficult; C - Average; D - Moderately easy; E - Very easy. __________

A - Excellent. B - Above Average. C - Average. D - Below Average. E - Poor. O - Insufficient Basis for Judgment.

Gives clear, reasonable assignments	A	B	C	D	E	O
Explains and organizes subject matter adequately	A	B	C	D	E	O
Evaluates and grades student achievement accurately and impartially:						
(a) Plays no favorites	A	B	C	D	E	O
(b) Provides opportunity through term papers, class discussions and tests for students to reveal what they know about course	A	B	C	D	E	O
Type and quality of testing:						
(a) Reasonable in length	A	B	C	D	E	O
(b) Covers work and objectives of the course adequately	A	B	C	D	E	O

Shows interest and effectiveness in giving needed individual help:						
(a) Is willing to meet with students	A	B	C	D	E	O
(b) Sets aside and keeps office hours (or appointments) for individual conferences	A	B	C	D	E	O
Respects the opinion and questions of his students	A	B	C	D	E	O
Stimulates thinking and independent work	A	B	C	D	E	O
Displays enthusiasm and interest in his subject	A	B	C	D	E	O
Is generally effective in his teaching	A	B	C	D	E	O

Do you dislike coming to this class and are you glad when it is over?

Yes_____ No_____

If so, is it because of (check one):

_______________ The Course
_______________ The Instructor
_______________ Both
_______________ Something Else

If you were considering whether or not to enroll for another course taught by the same instructor, would the fact that he was teaching it be (check one):

_______________ An added reason for taking it
_______________ Immaterial
_______________ An added reason for not taking

How does the instructor's conduct strike you? (check one)

_______________ Does he lecture to himself?
_______________ Does he maintain working rapport with his class?
_______________ Does he show off offensively?

THE FOLLOWING ARE OPTIONAL (use back of page if necessary)

List any mannerisms (include voice if applicable) of the instructor which detract from the effectiveness of his classroom presentation:

List any other suggestions which you can offer for improvement of the course.

List qualities which make the instructor outstanding.

COLLEGE OF MARIN
STUDENT RATING SHEET

Date_______ Course_______________ Section_____ Instructor_______________

Directions: Do NOT indicate your name any place on this sheet. This form is being used to improve the quality of instruction at the college, so thoughful judgment is requested. Make a check in the appropriate square to the right of the quality. CODE: AA-Above Average; A-Average; BA-Below Average; N-No judgement possible.

LIST OF QUALITIES	AA	A	BA	N
1. Knowledge of subject				
2. Use of current developments in subject area				
3. Interest in subject				
4. Explanation of difficult material				
5. Ability to make subject interesting				
6. Clarity of assignments				
7. Encouraging attitude toward student questions				
8. Ability to get classroom cooperation of students . .				
9. Ability to put students at ease				
10. Efficient use of class time				
11. Quality and use of voice				
12. General appearance				
13. Understanding of and sympathy for student problems . .				
14. Willingness to accept different points of view				
15. Impartiality in class, in grading				
16. Success in arousing out-of-class interest in subject .				
17. Willingness to help students out of class				
18. Ability to relate subject with other subject areas . .				
19. Sense of humor				
20. Enthusiasm for teaching				

CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Do you feel the class meetings were valuable to you? Yes No
2. Do you feel the tests fairly judged your knowledge of the subject? Yes No
3. Would you recommend this class to your friends? Yes No

Please make any additional comments below or on the reverse side of this page.

MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE

Student Rating of Instructors

Your instructor is seeking your reaction to this course and his methods of teaching. Your honest judgment is all the questionnaire requires.

Following is a list of ten qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate this instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items.

Place an "x" before one item in each of the ten categories listed:

1. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
____ Systematic and thorough
____ Adequate (could be better)
____ Inadequate (detracts from course)
____ Confused and unsystematic

2. TEACHING METHODS
____ Well planned and adapted to subject and students
____ Some variety of method
____ Same techniques used continuously
____ No evidence of planned methods

3. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS
____ Always eager to help
____ Moderately helpful
____ Avoids individual conferences
____ Cold, unconcerned with students

4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
____ Exceptionally well informed
____ Adequately informed
____ Not well informed
____ Very inadequately informed

5. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS
____ Excellent
____ Satisfactory
____ Sometimes unfair
____ Mostly careless and unfair

6. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN
____ Explanations clear and to point
____ Explanations usually adequate
____ Explanations often inadequate
____ Explanations seldom given, or usually inadequate

7. ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING
____ Continually makes you think for yourself
____ Stimulates considerable thinking
____ Not much thinking required
____ Discourages original thinking

8. SPEAKING ABILITY
____ Excellent
____ Good (does not detract from course)
____ Fair (detracts from course)
____ Poor (seriously handicaps learning)

9. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT
____ Enthusiastic (enjoys teaching)
____ Sometimes interested
____ Bored (routine interest)
____ Not interested (tired of subject)

10. GENERAL RATING
Compared to all instructors you have had, how do you rate this instructor?
____ Excellent
____ Good
____ Fair
____ Poor

COMMENTS:

PORTERVILLE COLLEGE STUDENT RATING OF INSTRUCTORS

Porterville College is rating itself in an effort to find out its quality of instruction. Your honest judgment is all this questionnaire requires. You are not to sign your name. Below is a list of 15 qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate the instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items. Circle the number that best describes this instructor most of the time in each classification: A, B, C, D, or F.

The 4 represents an "A" instructor. **Example:** "A" indicates an excellent teacher, one among the top ten you've ever had.
" 3 " "B" "
" 2 " "C" "
" 1 " "D" "
" 0 " "F" "

1.	GENERAL RATING COMPARED WITH ALL TEACHERS YOU'VE HAD	4	3	2	1	0
2.	ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER . . . . Does this teacher organize his lectures, clearly word his questions and seem to work ideas out systematically to help make the difficult subjects more easily understood?	4	3	2	1	0
3.	SUBJECT MATTER IS KEPT UP-TO-DATE	4	3	2	1	0
4.	KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT . . . . How well is this teacher informed in terms of your class' subject?	4	3	2	1	0
5.	TEACHING METHODS . . . . Some ways to impart and to teach give better results than others. Does this teacher try different ways, e.g. to teach as to lecture, ask questions for class answers, have student reports, term papers, field trips?	4	3	2	1	0
6.	CLASS MANAGEMENT AND DISCIPLINE . . . . Does this teacher seem to have students who talk when he is speaking, or disturb other members of the class? Do students show disrespect or disregard his directions?	4	3	2	1	0
7.	CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS . . . . Is this teacher helpful during the class, and outside of the class, by showing a personal or professional interest in you as one of his students?	4	3	2	1	0
8.	QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS . . . . Do his quizzes and examinations cover the important points of the course? Does he take the opportunity to review any questions and/or answers that may be of concern to students -- after the examination papers are returned?	4	3	2	1	0
9.	ABILITY TO EXPLAIN . . . . Are his explanations usually clear, to the point, and adequate for gaining an understanding of the important concepts (ideas) he presents or assigns?	4	3	2	1	0
10.	ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING . . . . Does this teacher stimulate you to think, inside and outside of class, and even sometimes cause you to perceive more clearly?	4	3	2	1	0
11.	SPEAKING ABILITY . . . . Do you believe that this teacher "speaks easily"? Does he usually seem to be at ease and comfortable when teaching before your class? Does he make you listen and pay attention to him by the way that he talks and the way that he conducts himself?	4	3	2	1	0
12.	PERSONAL APPEARANCE . . . . Do his appearance and clothing give evidence of pride and neatness?	4	3	2	1	0
13.	ENTHUSIASTIC ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT . . . . Is this teacher interested or even enthusiastic about his subject? Do you sometimes feel that you could get interested, too, in some of his ideas?	4	3	2	1	0
14.	SENSE OF HUMOR . . . . Can he give and/or take a joke? Do you find yourself laughing later about something that he said? Is he serious most of the time, but can on occasion give an interesting "twist" to a point to make it seem funny and interesting?	4	3	2	1	0
15.	LEVEL OF STANDARDS OF INSTRUCTION . . . . Do you think, and/or have you heard that he is a "tough" teacher? Is he teaching a college course or is he teaching as they teach in high school?	4	3	2	1	0
	Totals					

Add the total numbers circled; divide by 15; carry out to 2 decimal places.

Score ☐

Please use the back for further comments.

A PUPIL'S RATING SCALE OF AN INSTRUCTOR

Instructor's name. (Please print) ______________________ Course ______________________ Date ____________

Each of the qualities listed below is divided into three sections. Each section is divided into three degrees and numbered accordingly from 1 to 9, 1 being the highest degree and 9 the lowest. In rating, draw a circle around the number which best describes your instructor.

Your fair and honest opinion is what really counts. Your instructor desires this rating for his own self-improvement.

ORGANIZATION OF COURSE	1 2 3 Carefully planned; well organized.	4 5 6 Some organization but not always clear.	7 8 9 Lacks organization and planning.
TEACHING SKILL	1 2 3 Produces steady interest in subject; creates real desire; keeps things moving.	4 5 6 Teaching procedure seldom changes; student interest moderate.	7 8 9 Classes tend to be dry and uninteresting; class period drags.
PREPARATION FOR EACH CLASS	1 2 3 Shows definite evidence of careful preparation.	4 5 6 Shows some preparation; materials not always clear in instructor's mind.	7 8 9 Not well prepared; lacks accurate knowledge.
ENTHUSIASM AND INTEREST IN COURSE	1 2 3 Genuinely interested and enthusiastic.	4 5 6 Appears to be rather passively interested.	7 8 9 Course seems to be uninteresting to the instructor.
ASSIGNMENTS	1 2 3 Students understand clearly the tasks of each new assignment.	4 5 6 At times indefinite; often stated somewhat hurriedly.	7 8 9 Unreasonable; hurriedly given; vague.
JUDGMENT OF VALUES	1 2 3 Selects important ideas; omits unimportant items.	4 5 6 Sometimes overlooks important points, spending time on insignificant details.	7 8 9 Frequently misses important ideas; wanders off on trivial details.;
CLASS DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS	1 2 3 Questions challenging; demand sound thinking; discussions interesting and stimulating.	4 5 6 Questions rather easy and simple; often calls for memorized facts; discussions ramble.	7 8 9 Asks few questions; very little discussion.
POISE AND SELF-CONFIDENCE	1 2 3 Well poised; sure of himself; not easily upset.	4 5 6 Seems embarrassed at times; fairly self-confident.	7 8 9 Easily upset; uncertain as to procedure; lacks confidence.
EXAMINATIONS	1 2 3 Questions thought-provoking; carefully selected; clear.	4 5 6 Questions usually factual; require little thinking.	7 8 9 Examinations poorly planned and managed.
SCHOLARSHIP	1 2 3 Excellent mastery of subject; wide fund of knowledge in other fields.	4 5 6 Knowledge fair but without depth.	7 8 9 Knowledge frequently very inadequate.
ABILITY TO CREATE STUDENT INTEREST	1 2 3 Usually stimulates strong interest.	4 5 6 Arouses only mild student interest.	7 8 9 Classes drag and students are indifferent.
CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND DISCIPLINE	1 2 3 Efficient management; pupils orderly and attentive.	4 5 6 Satisfactory organization; few disciplinary problems.	7 8 9 Poor organization; many disciplinary problems.
SPEECH	1 2 3 Voice pleasant; speaks distinctly fluent.	4 5 6 Speaks fairly well.	7 8 9 Poor voice; words not clear; weak expression.
TOLERANCE	1 2 3 Encourages students to express opinions even though they differ with the instructor's ideas.	4 5 6 At times appears to be disturbed and impatient when students oppose instructor's views.	7 8 9 Resents opposition; intolerant.
SENSE OF HUMOR	1 2 3 Possesses keen sense of humor.	4 5 6 Rather sober and serious; somewhat humorous at times.	7 8 9 Shows little or no humor.
PERSONAL APPEARANCE	1 2 3 Appearance neat; well dressed and in good taste.	4 5 6 Appearance fair; somewhat untidy at times.	7 8 9 Unkempt; careless and untidy.
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS AND INSTRUCTOR	1 2 3 Attitude of friendliness; feeling of mutual interest.	4 5 6 Attitude somewhat indifferent; neither ill-will nor friendliness prevails.	7 8 9 Considerable spirit of antagonism between students and instructor; antagonistic air.

On the back of this form, PRINT any annoying mannerisms your instructor has developed which should be corrected. Also PRINT your criticisms of the course. These will be very helpful to your instructor's self-improvements. Do not sign your name.

Copyright, 1937, by Russell M. Eidsmoe, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa

ANSWER SHEET FOR A PUPIL'S RATING OF AN INSTRUCTOR

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Course						
Code No. of Course						
Instructor						
Code No. of Instructor						
Grade in Course						

TRAITS	YOUR RATINGS					
Organization						
Skill						
Preparation						
Enthusiasm						
Assignments						
Values						
Discussion						
Poise						
Examinations						
Scholarships						
Interest						
Discipline						
Speech						
Tolerance						
Humor						
Appearance						
Friendliness						

Date of Rating ____________________

Sex of Rater M____ F____

No.of Semesters At S.B.V.C. ____________

SANTA MONICA CITY COLLEGE

Student Opinion Of Teaching

Name of Instructor..Course.. Class Hour..................

Student's Major..Semester in College..

It is of first importance that the college be continuously informed of the quality of its teaching and the respects in which the teaching can be improved. Your evaluation may help.

This survey is made by the instructor in this class. He alone will see the ratings and comments. PLEASE BE FRANK!

I. Rate your instructor on the following characteristics, making each answer a separate judgment:

	(HIGH)				(LOW)
1. Interests students in his subject and stimulates thinking....................................	1	2	3	4	5
Comment..					
2. Takes an active personal interest in the progress of his class..............................	1	2	3	4	5
Comment..					
3. Is well versed in his subject and its applications..	1	2	3	4	5
Comment..					
4. Shows enthusiasm for his subject..	1	2	3	4	5
Comment..					
5. Gives reasonable and well-prepared tests...	1	2	3	4	5
Comment..					

II. Your instructor would like to know if there is something you believe he has done especially well in his teaching of this course:

....

....

....

III. Your instructor would appreciate knowing if you feel that there was anything that he did in an unsatisfactory manner:

....

....

....

IV. Your instructor would also like to know specific things you believe he might do to improve his teaching in this course:

....

....

....

....

....

(PLEASE USE THE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.)

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE ASSOCIATION
Student Rating of Instructors
(Adapted from Riley, The Student Looks at His Teacher)

Each junior college is rating itself in an effort to find out the quality of teaching in all junior colleges. Your answers to this questionnaire will be confidential; your instructor will turn in a summary without his name; results will be accumulated by your college officers. Your honest judgment is all the questionnaire requires.

Here is a list of ten qualities important to good teaching. Read each item carefully and decide how you would rate this instructor on that quality. If you have difficulty reaching a decision, select the answer that comes closest to your judgment about the instructor. Rate all items.

Place an "X" on one of the lines under each of the ten categories:

1. ORGANIZATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
Systematic and thorough ____
Adequate (could be better) ____
Inadequate (detracts from course) ____
Confused and unsystematic ____

2. TEACHING METHODS
Well planned and adapted to subject and students ____
Some variety of method ____
Same techniques used continuously ____
No evidence of planned methods ____

3. CONCERN FOR STUDENT PROGRESS
Always eager to help ____
Moderately helpful ____
Avoids individual conferences ____
Cold, unconcerned with students ____

4. KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT
Exceptionally well informed ____
Adequately informed ____
Not well informed ____
Very inadequately informed ____

5. QUALITY OF EXAMINATIONS
Excellent ____
Satisfactory ____
Sometimes unfair ____
Mostly careless and unfair ____

6. ABILITY TO EXPLAIN
Explanations clear and to point ____
Explanations usually adequate ____
Explanations often inadequate ____
Explanations seldom given, or usually inadequate ____

7. ENCOURAGEMENT OF THINKING
Continually makes you think for yourself ____
Stimulates considerable thinking ____
Not much thinking required ____
Discourages original thinking ____

8. SPEAKING ABILITY
Excellent ____
Good (does not detract from course ____
Fair (detracts from course) ____
Poor (seriously handicaps learning) ____

9. ATTITUDE TOWARD SUBJECT
Enthusiastic (enjoys teaching) ____
Sometimes interested ____
Bored (routine interest) ____
Not interested (tired of subject) ____

10. GENERAL RATING
Compared to all instructors you have had, how do you rate this instructor?
Excellent ____
Good ____
Fair ____
Poor ____

- -

Total checks in: Column 1 ________ x 4 = ________
Column 2 ________ x 3 = ________
Column 3 ________ x 2 = ________
Column 4 ________ x 1 = ________

TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE: ________

CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

EVALUATIONS

TEACHER SELF-APPRAISAL*

1. Regardless of how long we have been teaching, we never attain perfection. There is always a place for an intelligent self-analysis of our methods and our techniques.

2. Most people do not like to be criticized even though the criticism is constructive, just and friendly. Instead of waiting for someone to pass judgment on your work, why not make a critical self-appraisal? In this way you can discover your weak points and take steps to correct them.

3. In making a self-appraisal, you should consider in particular, lesson planning, conduct of the class session and testing. Remember that you are turning the searchlight upon yourself in order to see how your performance looks to the other person. The benefit you will derive from this procedure will be governed by your willingness to recognize your faults and your determination to correct them. The above suggestions are offered, not as a final answer to teaching problems, but as a basis for a re-check on the methods you are using.

LESSON PLANNING

1. Do you plan your lesson or do you go to class with only a general idea of what you are going to do?

2. Is the objective well defined and can it be accomplished by the presentation that you plan to make?

3. Do you study each particular topic to find the most effective way to present it?

4. Does your lesson plan include all of the important points and exclude the irrelevant?

5. Is your lesson plan logical in order and does it make a clear connection with what has gone before?

6. Does your lesson plan have application to some specific thing that the students are to do?

7. Do you make an intelligent and effective use of instructional aids?

*Acknowledgment - B. L. Fitzgerald, Assistant Director
Los Angeles Trade Technical Junior College

CONDUCT OF CLASS SESSION

1. Do you know what you are trying to do in class?

2. Do you tell the students the importance of the topic that is to be discussed and why?

3. Do you spend most of the time just talking? If you do, the chances are that the students do not learn much.

4. Do you have the class session organized so there is no waste of time?

5. Are you lowering your class standards by allowing students to take too much time for their intermission?

6. Are you prepared for questions asked or do you evade them?

7. Are you courteous and considerate in answering questions?

8. Do you hide the chalkboard with your body? Do you face the class or talk to the chalkboard?

9. Do you start and end your class session on time?

10. Do the students go to sleep in class? If they do, it is time for you to wake up.

TESTING

1. Do you go to the trouble to construct good tests?

2. Are your tests representative of the material given in class, clear as to meaning and of reasonable length?

3. Do you let your class go without tests because you do not like to grade the papers?

4. In grading tests, do you give each question a value in proportion to its importance?

5. Do you try to be fair and impartial in grading?

6. Do you have sufficient information on each student to establish fair term grades?

7. Do you hide poor teaching with high grades?

8. Do you realize that every time you give the students a test, you are testing yourself too?

MERCED COLLEGE
OBSERVATION APPOINTMENT SHEET

FACULTY MEMBER: ______________________________ Date: ________________

For my first visit to your class it seems appropriate that you know when I'm coming. Would it be convenient for me to visit your class during the following period and date? ____

Please indicate below:

Yes _____ No _______

If no, please mention the reason:

Thank you very much. Please return to __________________________________.

____
Administrator

MONTEREY PENINSULA COLLEGE. . . .ANNUAL REPORT ON CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL*

INSTRUCTOR____________________ Preliminary

DEPARTMENT____________________ Final Report____________________
School Year

CREDENTIAL HELD:____________________ ____________________
Subject or Assignment

EXPIRATION DATE:____________________

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN MONTEREY
First Year Second Year Third Year Total Years____________________

Length of time teacher has been under your supervision:__________ __________
Years Months

All categories below must include a brief description in concrete and specific terms of the criteria that were considered in the evaluation.

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE IN THE CLASSROOM:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
COMMENTS:			

RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS AND ADULTS:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	
COMMENTS:			

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
COMMENTS:	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

PERSONAL QUALITIES:	Outstanding	Very Good	Good
COMMENTS:	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	

---

* In the case of permanent staff members, this report will be completed every three years.

SUMMARY STATEMENT: (This space must not be left blank.)

RECOMMENDATION FOR RE-ELECTION--To be completed at the second Evaluation Conference held before the last Friday before Spring recess.

In all cases of recommendation for re-election, the final decision rests upon action of the Board of Trustees. The board requires a report of outstanding or very good in all major areas to justify recommendation for permanent tenure.

FOR SECOND YEAR TEACHERS ONLY:

The teacher's possibility of achieving tenure has been discussed with him and is summarized above. Yes No

RECOMMENDED FOR RE-EMPLOYMENT or RECOMMENDED FOR PERMANENT TENURE IF A THIRD YEAR PROBATIONARY TEACHER Yes No

Date ______________ Signature of Superintendent ______________

TEACHER'S STATEMENT:

I have read this report and recognize that I have the privilege of discussing it with the Superintendent of the District if I so desire. I realize that I may see this report at any subsequent time.

Date ______________ Signature of Teacher ______________

Copies to: Superintendent
Vice President
Teacher on request

MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE
TEACHER EVALUATION WORK SHEET

TEACHER__________________________________DEPARTMENT____________________

SUBJECTS TAUGHT____

DATE_______________________________________YEAR OF SERVICE____________________

Graded Outstanding, Satisfactory, Conditional, Unsatisfactory

EVALUATION CRITERIA:					REMARKS
1. Knows subject matter.	O	S	C	U	
2. Communicates subject matter to students using teaching techniques and procedures effectively(voice, visual, organization, etc.)	O	S	C	U	
3. Works constructively with administration and colleagues in professional duties.	O	S	C	U	
4. Assists students willingly outside of assigned classroom hours.	O	S	C	U	
5. Is competent in functional details (classroom management, reports, attendance, etc.)	O	S	C	U	
6. Understands student behavior and learning problems (motivation, etc.)	O	S	C	U	
7. Instructs at the educational level of the course he teaches.	O	S	C	U	
8. Has respect of and for colleagues and students.	O	S	C	U	
9. Shows enthusiasm for teaching and for the general college program including extra-curricular activities.	O	S	C	U	
10. Is emotionally stable, professionally mature, and perceptive of his educational role.	O	S	C	U	
11. Is professional regarding personal conduct, grooming, and college obligations.	O	S	C	U	
12. Is energetic and free from detrimental physical impairments.	O	S	C	U	

A check of outstanding, conditional, or unsatisfactory in any category must be accompanied by an explanatory remark from the evaluator.

EVALUATOR____________________________________

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING SHEET
January 15th Report

____
Date

____
Name of Instructor

1. How well has this instructor completed his (her) assignment this year?

Outstanding | Superior | Competent | Needs Improvement | Borderline

2. This instructor's ability and willingness to work with his colleagues and the total school community has been:

Outstanding | Superior | Competent | Needs Improvement | Borderline

3. Professional growth of this instructor has been:

Outstanding | Superior | Competent | Needs Improvement | Borderline

4. This instructor's relationships with students in his (her) assigned courses are:

Outstanding | Superior | Competent | Needs Improvement | Borderline

Please answer either item 5 or 6:

5. If this instructor is a 1st or 2nd year instructor at Orange Coast College do you recommend he (she) be retained on our staff for the next school year?

Yes _____ Yes, with reservations _____ No _____

If no or yes, with reservations - cite specific reasons______________________________

____

____

6. If this instructor is eligible to become permanent, do you recommend he (she) be granted tenure? Yes_____ No_____

If "no," cite specific reasons______________________________

____

____

____
Signature of Observer

I have received a copy of this report:______________________________
Signatute of Instructor

Rating: Outstanding: Unusually able in this area. Superior: Very well qualified in this area. Competent: This level of performance is expected. Needs Improvement: Self-explanatory. Borderline: Competence is doubtful.

[illegible] VILLE COLLEGE INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORM

Class Name: ____________ In Room ____________ Instructor ____________

Date of Visit ____________ Number of Students in Class:

Day and Hour ____________ Men ________ Women ________

This form is to assist in the evaluation of current teaching and teaching potential by classroom observation. When other means than classroom visitation are used in making an evaluation of the instructor's efforts, an explanation will be made.

Definitions:

Excellent	- Extremely good of its kind; first-class; prime; select. Implies superiority in quality and action; surpasses or goes beyond good qualities.
Good	- Sufficient or satisfactory for its purpose. Ample; considerable; honest; sincere; that which is serviceable, fit, beneficial, pleasant, and adequate.
Fair	- Free from marked merit or defeat; average; mediocre; a fair chance of success. Room for improvement.
Poor	- Not good, as in quality or workmanship; inferior. Unfavorable, inefficient, not satisfactory, inadequate. Needs definite improvement.
N.A.	- Not applicable.

Part I. Evaluation check-list of the classroom; the instructor; and instruction.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Exc.	N.A.
A. **Physical Conditions**					
1. lighting					
2. heating, cooling, ventilation					
3. equipment					
4. bulletin board					
5. distractions, absence of					
6. adequacy of student space					
7. other					
B. **Instructor's**					
1. dress					
2. voice					
a. volume					
b. modulation					
c. change of pace					
d. pleasantness					
e. ease of delivery					
f. speed					
g. emphasis					
h. clarity					

B Continued:

	Poor	Fair	Good	Exc.	N.A.
3. posture					
4. obvious health					
5. emotional stability					
6. judgment					
7. tact					
8. adaptability					
9. enthusiasm					
10. movement					
11. other					
C. Instruction					
1. overall effectiveness					
2. variety					
a. lecture					
b. demonstration					
c. discussion					
d. audio-visual aids					
e. question & answer period					
f. drill					
g. tests and quizzes					
h. discipline					
i. review					
j. other					

Part II. This is an observer's evaluation in answer to teaching methods and routine, as observed during the class period.

1. The subject matter was:

______very interesting
______interesting
______boresome
______unusual
______very difficult
______relatively difficult
______easy

Comments: -

2. Are any of these methods used in instruction:

______outside reading
______reports
______field trips
______guest speakers
______other

Comments: -

3. Was an assignment made for the class session?

Yes______________No______________

If so, the assignment made was:

______too long
______about right
______too short
______vague and hazy
______clearly presented & understood

Comments: -

4. How much interest did students show?

______none
______little
______moderate
______considerable

Comments: -

5. How effectively was class time used? (lecture)
______started late, time dragged
______finished early
______most of class time used
______started promptly, used all of class time

Comments: -

6. How effectively was class time used? (laboratory)
______started late, time dragged
______finished early
______most of class time used
______started promptly, used all of class time
______instructor available for individual student assistance

Comments: -

7. Was the teacher well prepared?
______no written or definite plans
______some notes and plans
______evidence of thorough planning
______course outline was being followed
______other

Comments: -

8. To what extent did students become involved in classwork?
______some participated
______most participated
______all participated
______the assignment did not lend itself for student participation

Comments: -

9. How varied were the teaching methods?
______uses a single technique
______uses several techniques
______uses a wide variation of techniques

Comments: -

10. How evident and how good is the rapport between teacher and students?
______no evidence of student-teacher harmonious relationships
______average relationships
______students show great confidence in instructor
______repeated evidence of friendly relationships

Comments: -

11. What methods were used?
______summaries of previous lesson
______summaries of main points in assignment
______a test or quiz
______student summary given
______no summary or review of work covered

Comments: -

****

COMMENTS:

****

To the instructor: I hereby certify that I have had the above evaluation explained to me and that I have received this copy of the evaluation. (Please return this form to the evaluator.) If the instructor wants to receive a copy of this evaluation, circle, Yes.

Signature of Instructor______________________ Date of signature__________

Signature of Evaluator______________________ Title__________ Date__________

SWEETWATER JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

Certificated Personnel Evaluation Report

Name ______________________________ Last First Middle

Full-time ☐
Part-time ☐

Years in District (including this year) ______________________

Assignment ______________________________

		College	Major	Year
Degrees:	BA ☐			
	MA ☐			
	PhD ☐			
	Other ☐			

Credential(s) held ______________________________

I. UNDER LINE STRONG POINTS AND CIRCLE WEAK POINTS

Teaching Technique
Subject Knowledge and Preparation
Discriminate in Criticisms
Enthusiasm
Sense of Humor

Appearance
Voice
Health
Organization
Accuracy and Promptness of Records

Use of Supplies and Equipment
Loyalty and Cooperation
Acceptance of Suggestions
Co-curricular Activities

Relationship:
- Student -Instructor
- Instructor - Instructor
- Instructor - Administration
- Community

II. OVERALL EVALUATION: (check one)

☐ SATISFACTORY
☐ IMPROVEMENT NEEDED - Needs experience or weaknesses corrected
☐ UNSATISFACTORY - Fails to meet requirements

III. COMMENTS: ______________________________

The employee must sign this evaluation report, indicating awareness of the report, if the overall evaluation indicates IMPROVEMENT NEEDED or UNSATISFACTORY.

Employee's comments, if desired: ______________________________

Date ______________ Employee's Signature ______________

IV. RECOMMENDATION: (March 15 only)

Re-employ ☐
Dismiss ☐

Date ______________ Evaluator's Signature ______________

Evaluation reports, when due, are to be forwarded directly to the Personnel Department.

November 1 (first year only)
December 21 (all probationary)
March 15 (all certificated)

COMMITTEE EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

Instructor________________________Status__________Subject________________

School Year__________________

Reemployment Recommended__________________________

Reemployment Not Recommended_______________________

Evaluation Committee Signatures:	Date	Instructor's Signature	Date
____________________	________	____________________	________
____________________	________	(Instructor's signature does not mean agreement with report; it means the teacher has seen the report and has had an opportunity to discuss it.)	
____________________	________		
____________________	________		

In the five areas below the Committee should indicate principal strengths and weaknesses of the instructor, along with recommendations for improvement and what has happened because of the recommendations. These should be documented with specific anecdotal reports of instances which illustrate the weakness or strength.

I. INSTRUCTIONAL SKILLS AND EFFECTIVENESS:

II. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS:

III. PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:

IV. PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH OTHERS: STUDENTS, FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION

V. COMMUNITY AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE:

In the section below indicate what you consider this instructor's potential for growth is in his service at College of Marin.

Indicate this instructor's growth during his service at College of Marin.

PERFORMANCE REPORT ON PROMOTIONAL CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

Name ______________________________ Employee No. ____________
Last First Middle

School or Section ______________ Position ____________ Status ____________

For period from ______________ to ______________

1. Conferences with this employee were held on (dates) ______________

2. I conferred with this employee regarding this report on (date) ______________

3. Specific needs discussed and recommendation made for improving services: (Use other side if necessary)

4. I consider the services of this employee to be:

WEAK	SATISFACTORY	STRONG	OUTSTANDING

(If rating is unsatisfactory, use Form 1015)

I have received a copy of this report.
I understand that any written statement I forward to the Personnel Division regarding thi performance report will be attached to the copy which is filed there.

(Signed) ______________________________
Employee Date

(Signed) ______________________________
Head of School or Section Date

Instructions to Principals and Section Heads: Prepare original and 3 copies of this form and forward original and one copy to your Assignment Administrator, Assistant Superintendent, or Branch Head within one week after end of period. The second copy is for your school files an the third copy should be given to the employee.
In case the employee is unavailable or unwilling to sign, that fact should be indicated in th signature space on all copies and the employee's copy should be forwarded along with original and first copy. The Personnel Division will deliver the form to the employee.

Instructions to Branch Heads: Forward the original of this form (and the employee's copy, i unsigned) to the Personnel Division, Department A. Keep one copy for your files.

I recommend that this employee: ( ) be retained in this position.
( ) be discontinued from this position at the close of this school year.

(Signed) ______________________________
Assistant Superintendent or Branch Head Date

(Memo A102)

NOTICE OF UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE OF CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

Name ______________________________ (Last) (First) (Middle) Employee No. ______________

School Section ______________________________ Grade Subject ______________ Status ______________

For period from ______________________________ to ______________________________

visited the above employee and observed his work on the following dates: ______________________________

conferred with this employee regarding this notice on (date) ______________________________

I consider the services of this employee to be unsatisfactory for the period indicated for the following reasons: (Continue n other side if necessary.)

I took the following steps to help this teacher improve: (Continue on other side if necessary.)

I recommend that this employee:
( ) be continued in service in this school or section.
( ) be continued in service in another school or section.
( ) be discontinued from service.

I have received a copy of this report. I understand that any written statement I forward to the Personnel Division regarding this performance report will be attached to the copy which is filed there.

Signed) ______________________________
Department Chairman, Vice-Principal or Dean (Optional) Date

(Signed) ______________________________
Employee Date

(Signed) ______________________________
Head of School or Section Date

INSTRUCTIONS TO HEADS OF SCHOOLS OR SECTIONS: Prepare original and 3 copies of this form, have employee sign all copies, and forward original and first copy to your Assignment Administrator, Assistant Superintendent, or Branch Head within one week after end of period. The second copy is for your school files, and the third copy should be given to the employee. In case the employee is unavailable or unwilling to sign, that fact should be indicated in the signature space on all copies and the mployee's copy should be forwarded along with the original and first copy. The Personnel Division will deliver the form to the mployee.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BRANCH HEADS: Forward the original of this form (and the employee's copy if not signed by employee) to the Personnel Division, Department A. Keep one copy for your files.

I recommend that this employee:
( ) be retained in service in this division
( ) be discontinued from service

(Signed) ______________________________
Head of District, Branch, or Division Date

LACSPD Form 1015-8 9-64 (A34)

SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET

COALINGA COLLEGE

CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL EVALUATION ______________
(School Year)

INSTRUCTOR ______________________________ Fall 1______2______3______
Spring 1______2______3______

_____PROBATIONARY _____PERMANENT SUBJECTS ______________________________

_____First_____Second_____Third _____Full Time _____Part time

Date of Visitation ____________________ Time ______________ Length ____________

STRENGTHS AND, IF APPROPRIATE, SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT WILL BE INDICATED IN EACH CATEGORY. SEE THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS SHEET FOR SPECIFIC AND GENERAL ITEMS APPLYING TO 1, 2, 3 BELOW.

1. Preparation for Instruction:

2. Instructional Effectiveness:

3. Professional Attitudes:

Administrator's Summary Statement:

*Recommendation:

Date ____________________________ ______________________________
Signature of Dean of Instruction

- -

Instructor's Comment:

I have read this report and recognize that I have the privilege of discussing it with the President if I so desire.

Date ____________________________ ______________________________
Signature of Instructor

*In all cases the final action for re-employment rests with the Board of Trustees.

1. Preparation for Instruction: Planning for the course; continuity of instruction; activities related to objectives; development of course outline and guides.

2. Instructional Effectiveness: Illustration appropriate to course and lesson; speaks interestingly and understandably; focused discussions involving whole class; creates a favorable learning atmosphere; creates an interest in the subject; expects a high standard of performance; provides for individual differences; maintains a dignity appropriate to the profession; is tactful and considerate; is well groomed; has good health and energy; has emotional stability and control; has integrity and is sincere; grades students fairly and can rate them at reasonable times as the course progresses; assignments clear.

3. Professional Attitudes: Cooperation with colleagues; cooperation with administration; service on committees; cooperation and effectiveness in student activities; promptness of reports and accuracy of records; sense of responsibility toward school, school district; and community; attitude toward professional organizations.

____
Date

TEACHER EVALUATION FORM

Adopted April 16, 1963

NAME______________________________ SCHOOL______________________________

CLASSES TAUGHT	NO. SECTIONS	SIZE OF CLASSES

Non-Teaching Assignments ______________________________

____

CLASSES OBSERVED	DATE OF OBSERVATION	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	LENGTH OF OBSERVATIONS

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	COMMENTS
I. PERSONAL QUALITIES			
1. Personal appearance			
2. Health			
3. Self-confidence			
4. Punctuality			
5. Tact			
6. Voice Control			
7. Emotional control			
8. Cooperation			
9. Sense of humor			
10. Standards of personal behavior			
11. Judgment			
II. PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE			
1. Daily preparation			
2. Attention to individual needs			
3. Attention to course content and scope			
4. Motivation			
5. Resourcefulness & originality			
6. Knowledge of subject matter			
III. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT			
1. Control of environment			
2. Promptness and accuracy of reports			
3. Class management			
IV. TEACHER-PUPIL RELATIONSHIP			
1. Attitude toward pupils			
2. Understanding of pupils			
3. Tact and consideration			
4. Influence on attitude of pupils towards others			
V. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDE AND GROWTH			
1. Observance of professional ethics			
2. Participation in professional activities*			
3. Interest in student activities			
4. Effective parent relationship			
5. Community participation*			
6. Inservice improvement			

*Membership in a particular organization will not be a required criteria for a satisfactory rating.

VI. EVALUATION OF EXTRA ASSIGNMENTS ______________________________

VII. GENERAL RATING ______________________________

____

COMMENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR:

Date____________________ Signature of Administrator____________________

Teacher Comments on Above Report:

In What Way Can We Help You Improve Your Teaching?

Date____________________ Signature of Teacher____________________

Teacher's signature indicates that report has been discussed but does not necessarily signify that the teacher agrees with the results. (If there is no appeal to the Superintendent within five days, acceptance of rating is indicated.)

SUPERINTENDENT'S COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Date____________________ Signature of Superintendent____________________

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT
TEACHERS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES
San Diego City Schools

Name (last, first, middle)

Prob. Year: 1______ 2______ 3______

Permanent______ Hourly______

Date

For Personnel Division Use

College

Department

Subject Field

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPETENCE	UNSATIS-FACTORY	REQUIRES IMPROVE-MENT	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE	OUT-STANDING
1. Knowledge of subject					
2. Consistent and careful planning in accordance with course of study					
3. Development and use of instructional techniques in meeting individual differences					
4. Motivation and direction of students' learning activities					
5. Rapport with students					
6. Evaluation of students' work					
7. Interest in and enthusiasm about teaching					
8. Other					

COMMENTS:

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS	REQUIRES IMPROVE-MENT	SATIS-FACTORY
1. Grooming and general appearance		
2. Apparent physical health and energy		
3. Apparent emotional and social adjustment		
4. Use of good judgment		
5. Voice and speech		
6. Other		

COMMENTS:

APX 103A 1-2511C65-1

PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES AND GROWTH	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT	SATISFACTORY	VERY EFFECTIVE
1. Observance of ethics of the teaching profession			
2. Response to supervision and suggestions for improvement			
3. Relationships with other school personnel			
4. Willingness to share in college-wide responsibilities			
5. Promptness and accuracy with reports			
6. Response to authorized policies and procedures			
7. Other			

COMMENTS:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Evaluator	Teacher

OVER-ALL PROFESSIONAL APPRAISAL

General evaluation of the teacher's performance in his present position:

UNSATISFACTORY	REQUIRES IMPROVEMENT	EFFECTIVE	VERY EFFECTIVE	OUTSTANDING

I feel that the possibility of meeting standards for permanency is:	POOR	QUESTIONABLE	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT	NOT APPLICABLE

Teacher's Signature*	Evaluator's Signature	Title
Date of conference with teacher	Reviewed by (signature)	Title

*This signature indicates that the teacher and evaluator together discussed this report. It does not necessarily denote agreement with all factors of the evaluation.

San Jose Junior College District
INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION REPORT

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ Other

Name ____________________

Observations (by whom, dates) ____________________

Conferences (by whom, dates) ____________________

Rate each item by a check mark on the line. (See reverse) Show by comment if unable to rate. Comments required for 1 or 2 rating.

	Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Strong to Excellent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A. ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHING Comments:							
B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS Comments:							
C. STUDENT ACCEPTANCE Comments:							
D. FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS Comments:							
E. DISTRICT RELATIONSHIPS Comments:							
F. PERSONAL QUALITIES Comments:							
G. PROFESSIONAL STRENGTHS Comments:							

SUMMARY EVALUATION

Recommendation:
☐ This employee should be retained
☐ Permanent employment depends on further improvement
☐ Continued employment not recommended

____
s/Administrator

____
Date

____
s/Instructor

My signature indicates that the basis of this report has been discussed with me and that I have received a copy of it.

Formal evaluation procedures are designed to review and emphasize the instructor's responsibility to provide teaching service of the highest quality. They shall recognize excellence, and shall likewise identify ways in which the instructor can improve the quality of his teaching.

Probationary instructors shall be evaluated semi-annually, but any instructor may be formally evaluated whenever the procedures may lead to increased teaching effectiveness.

All available sources shall be used to make the report clear, complete, and accurate.

In items A-G below the descriptive words or phrases are suggested as guides to assist in identifying factors that relate to effective teaching.

Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Strong to Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

A. ORGANIZATION FOR TEACHING

1-2: Inadequate planning, disorganized, goals not clear, lacks initiative, poorly prepared materials

3-4-5: Adequate and appropriate planning, usually recognizable goals, reasonable initiative, acceptably prepared materials

6-7: Creative planning, clear and complete materials, always punctual, clearly defined goals, fair and effective tests

B. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1-2: Confusing, uninspiring, not at junior college level, student achievement below expectancy, poor voice quality and speech, lacks teaching skills

3-4-5: Logical, reasonable enthusiasm, objective, satisfactory student achievement, good voice and diction, satisfactory teaching skills

6-7: Resourceful, superior voice and vocabulary, highly motivating, consistently outstanding student achievement, excellent teaching skills

C. STUDENT ACCEPTANCE

1-2: Not respected, poor rapport, questionable fairness, gives little office help, undignified

3-4-5: Respected, considered fair, has good rapport, productive office hours

6-7: In high respect, regarded as truly professional teacher, office assistance highly appreciated, excellent rapport

D. FACULTY RELATIONSHIPS

1-2: Anti-social, uncooperative, questionable ethics, not accepted by colleagues

3-4-5: Accepted by colleagues, cooperative, discreet, participates with faculty and department, accepts assigned responsibilities

6-7: Sought by colleagues, recognized leader, initiates and carries out, highly ethical

E. DISTRICT RELATIONSHIPS

1-2: Defensive, late and inaccurate with reports, antagonistic or insensitive to criticism, violates regulations, late to class or dismisses early

3-4-5: Handles routines and reports well, accepts criticism constructively, observes regulations, cooperative, represents District satisfactorily in community

6-7: Welcomes criticism and uses it with discrimination, handles routines efficiently, community leader, gives freely of time and resources

F. PERSONAL QUALITIES

1-2: Unkempt appearance, prejudiced, lacks maturity, excessive absences, rude or tactless, lacks integrity

3-4-5: Courteous, tactful, usually well-controlled, mature, adequate health and physical stamina, satisfactory impression

6-7: Impressive poise, excellent self-control, neatly groomed, obvious health and vigor, integrity

G. PROFESSIONAL STRENGTHS

1-2: Shows little interest in the profession, inadequate subject field knowledge, professional disloyalty, questionable ethical standards, inexpert in assignment

3-4-5: Up-to-date and well-informed in field, identifies self with the profession, ethical

6-7: Broad knowledge reflecting continuous growth in field, assumes and demonstrates ethical leadership, pride in profession, resourceful and versatile

EVALUATION REPORT

ON

PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTORS

EVALUATION OF LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECH PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTORS

For Period Ending __________

Please return to Dean Johnson's Office on or before ________

Name________________________________ Dept.________________________ Class______________

Conference with this employee held on: (Date)______________________________

A. PERSONAL QUALITIES: (Check one in each area)	Unsatis-factory	Weak	Average	Strong	Out-standi
Teacher attendance record					
Tact and Courtesy					
Quality of judgment					
Personal appearance					
Good speaking voice					
Sense of humor					
Poise in classroom					
Overall evaluation of A (Check one)					
B. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:(Check one in each area)					
Acceptance of assignment responsibilities					
Cooperation with Administrators & Instructors					
Professional ethics					
Overall evaluation of B (Check one)					
C. COMPETENCE: (Check one in each area)					
[redacted]					
Promptness in starting and closing classes					
Attention to daily attendance					
Accuracy of grading					
Classroom routine efficiency					
Lesson planning performance					
Preparation of instructional materials					
Student control and classroom morale					
Student achievement					
Knowledge and use of basic skills					
Knowledge of current practices					
Overall evaluation of C (Check one)					

Remarks:

Department Head's Signature	Date	Instructor's Payroll Signature Date

I have read this report but my signature does not necessarily indicate my agreement

REEDLEY COLLEGE
Reedley, California

EVALUATION REPORT ON PROBATIONARY CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE

NAME OF TEACHER ______________________________
CLASS ____________________
PERIOD ____________________
DATE OF VISITATION __________
VISITATION NO. ____________

Prepare in quadruplicate copies to teacher, division chairman, dean of instruction, superintendent.

I. CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES:

______ Satisfactory ______ Needs Improvement ______ Unsatisfactory

Comments:

II. PERSONALITY:

______ Satisfactory ______ Needs Improvement ______ Unsatisfactory

Comments:

III. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:

______ Satisfactory ______ Needs Improvement ______ Unsatisfactory

Comments:

IV. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH:

______ Satisfactory ______ Needs Improvement ______ Unsatisfactory

Comments:

* * * * * * * * * * *

Date of conference held with teacher: ________________
Signature of observer: ________________________
Signature of teacher: _________________________

The signature of the person observed does not necessarily indicate agreement, but only that the teacher has seen the rating and received a copy of the evaluation report.

TEACHER'S COMMENTS:

Explanation of Page 1

The Evaluation Report is to be used for the following purposes:

1. Evaluation of in-service training.
2. Evaluation for re-employment.
3. Evaluation of the teacher's relations with regard to the students, the community, and the profession.
4. Basis for the conference following the evaluation.

When checking any item under the headings of: (1) needs imporvement; (2) unsatisfactory; or (3) any item when not checked, the evaluator shall present a statement written under Comments, explaining the area or item that is unsatisfactory, or needs improvement, or why the item is not checked.

Suggested Criteria for Evaluation

Items on Page 1

I. CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES:

Student Relationships: Creates a favorable learning atmosphere. Creates an interest in the subject. Expects a high standard of performance. Provides for individual differences.
Presentation of Material: Applies subject matter to present day needs. Uses reference and supplementary material. Is well prepared for class work. Speaks interestingly and understandably.
Classroom Management: Provides for physical well being of students. Develops proper social control.
Personal Attributes: Is tactful and considerate. Is well groomed. Has good health and energy. Has emotional stability and control. Has integrity and is sincere.
Other: Grading procedures. Should be able to rate the student at all times.

II. PERSONALITY:
Humor, stable temperament, tactful, friendly, broad interests, appearance.

III. PROFESSIONAL ATTITUDES:
Cooperation with colleagues, cooperation with administration, service on committees, cooperation and effectiveness in student activities, promptness of reports and accuracy of records, sense of responsibility toward school, school district and community, attitude toward professional organizations.

IV. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH:

Uses professional publications, attends professional meetings (workshops) travels, seeks employment in subject area, seeks assistance from others, is familiar with community problems in subject areas, utilizes community resources, works on school and community committees, can identify his goals, has hobbies in subject areas, has done research.

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE

Evaluation and Recommendation of Probationary Instructor

Name of Instructor: ____________________ Semesters completed at S.B.V.C. __________

Rating | **Comments (cite specific evidence where possible)**

1. Intellectual vigor

Definitely Superior	Coll. Tchr. Average	Below Coll. Average

2. Interest in teaching

Enthusiastic	Average	"It's a good job"

3. Preparation for teaching his subject

Strong	Average	Below Average

4. Personal standards in scholarship and professional activity

High self standards	Satisfactory	Will accept mediocrity

5. Standards of performance he sets for students

Presses for excellence	Accepts Coll. Norm	Condones mediocrity

6. Quality of writing and lecturing

Excellent	Average	Barely Acceptable

7. Skill in classroom & teaching laboratory

Superior	Average	Barely Acceptable

8. Interest in students

Frequent & close contacts	Some Real interest	Little Concern

9. Acceptance by students

Sought by students	Average	Some complaints mostly apathy or avoidance

10. Acceptance by colleagues

Without reservation	Satisfactory	Not Accepted

Recommendation:

____________________ Division Chairman

____________________ Date

Santa Barbara Junior College District

EVALUATION FORM FOR PROBATIONARY INSTRUCTOR

Name of Probationary Instructor ____________________ Date ____________________

Class Visited ____________________

Please complete each category in this form in the following way (1) Evaluate the instructor's performance by placing (X) at the appropriate place along the scale (2) Write a description of the instructor's performance, (3) Give example(s) that support the description. In addition to each category, please give an overall rating on the scale at the bottom of the page. One copy of form is for the instructor, one copy for the division chairman, one copy for the Instruction Office.

PERSONALITY

High | 1 2 3 4 5 | Low

Description

Examples

KNOWLEDGE

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Description

Examples

PERFORMANCE

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Description

Examples

OVERALL RATING

| 1 2 3 4 5 |

Evaluator's Signature ____________________

Date ____________________

Instructor's Signature ____________________

Date ____________________

PH:mr
11/22/65

SANTA MONICA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Santa Monica, California

PROBATIONARY TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT

FALL SEMESTER (Short Form)

Name ____________________ **School** ________________ **Date** ________

Grade, Subject Field, or Department ____________________________

Number in Class or Average Number in Classes ____________________

Number of Years of Teaching in Santa Monica ____ **Probationary Year** ____

Total Number of Years of Teaching ________________

STRENGTHS:

IMPROVEMENT NEEDED:

Visits requested of Central Office (indicate person or persons requested)

Signed:

______________________________ **Date** ____________________
Principal or President

______________________________ **Date** ____________________
Director of Education or School Administrator

TEACHER'S COMMENTS:

______________________________ **Date** ____________________

(Signature of teacher does not necessarily imply agreement. It is merely an acknowledgment that report has been read.)

FAZ:cb
11-15-60

CLASSROOM VISITATION

EVALUATIONS

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE

REPORT ON CLASS VISIT

It is hoped that this brief report will help determine systematically and at appropriate times the accomplishments of our probationary instructors.

Instructor ______________________________ Date of Visit ____________

Class Visited ____________________________ Time ______________

Lecture __________ Laboratory ____________

Comment on the following:

1. Preparation and presentation of material ____________________

2. Student-teacher relations ____________________

3. Other observations ____________________

Visit made by ______________________________

Form #1

CHABOT COLLEGE

REPORT OF CLASS VISIT
(Division Chairman)

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

Instructor	Date of report
Course	Length of visit
Time	Date of visit

Topic, command of subject matter and significance of material:

Preparation for this session:

Relevancy to course objectives:

Presentation: logic followed, clarity, level of interest and vitality:

Response to and from students:

____

____

____

General evaluation of this visit:

____

____

____

Other points:

____

____

____

Suggestions:

____

____

____

I have received and read this report.

____________________	____________________
Instructor's signature	Administrator's signature

Date of consultation____________________

Form #1
JM:mm
10/9/63

Form #2

CHABOT COLLEGE

REPORT OF CLASS VISIT
(Deans, Assistant Deans)

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

Instructor ______________________ Date of report ______________________

Course ______________________ Length of visit ______________________

Time ____________ Date of visit ____________

#1 Shows outstanding strength
#2 Meets Chabot College standards of strong performance
#3 Needs improvement
#4 Below Chabot College standards

Evaluation:

☐ Topic, command of subject matter and significance of material:

____

____

____

☐ Preparation for this session:

____

____

____

☐ Relevancy to course objectives:

____

____

____

☐ Presentation: logic followed, clarity, level of interest and vitality:

____

____

____

☐ Response to and from students:

☐ General Evaluation of this visit:

Other Points:

Suggestions:

I have received and read this report.

Instructor's signature

Administrator's signature

Date of consultation____________

Form #2
JM:mm
10-9-63

Form #3

CHABOT COLLEGE

REPORT OF CLASS VISIT

This form is to be used as a basis for consultation following a class visit. After the pertinent items are completed, one copy of the evaluation will be given to the instructor, and one copy will be placed in the instructor's personnel file. The instructor may append his written comments concerning this evaluation to his personnel file copy if he so desires.

Instructor	Date of report
Course	Length of visit
Time / Date of visit	

Organization and Control:

Topic; relevancy to the course objectives:

Presentation; student response:

General evaluation of this visit:

Suggestions:

____

____

____

I have received and read this report.

____
Instructor's signature

____
Administrator's signature

____
Date of consultation

Form #3
JW:m
3-18-64

TAFT COLLEGE
WEST KERN JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICT

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION FORM

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION REPORT

Name of Instructor Visited: ______________________ **Dept. & No. of Course** ____________

Date of Visit: ______________ **Class Hour** ______________ **Length of Visit** ____________

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION: (use by observer is optional) _____ Lecture _____ Question-Answer

_____ Recitation _____ Discussion _____ Audio-Visual

Other comments of techniques used, if appropriate:

OBSERVATION CHECK-LIST (use by observer is optional):

	1	2	3	4	5
Presents subject matter clearly ______					
Employs means to make materials interesting ______					
Appears to motivate students to further study ______					
Appears to promote a feeling of friendliness ______					
Appears enthusiastic in presentation ______					
Handles classroom discipline and organization well ______					
Is sensitive to appropriate physical conditions within classroom ______					
Instructor's personal grooming appears to be satisfactory ______					
Instructor's health appears to be satisfactory ______					

Meaning of Ranking: 1—Excellent; 2—Superior; 3—Average; 4—Below Average; 5—Poor

EVALUATION (observer will express, in paragraph style, his evaluation of the instructor's teaching during this particular class visit; it will represent his professional judgment):

RECOMMENDATIONS OF OBSERVER TO THE INSTRUCTOR:

The above evaluation represents my best professional judgment:

Signature of observer: ______________________ **Date** ____________

I have had the opportunity to read this report and discuss it with the observer (written comments may be made on the other side of the sheet if the instructor desires):

Signature of instructor: ______________________ **Date** ____________

Distribution: Original to administrative office file; copies to observer's and instructor's files.